arXiv:1607.04387v1 [math.LO] 15 Jul 2016

DISINTEGRATED ORDER ONE DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS AND ALGEBRAIC GENERAL SOLUTIONS

JAMES FREITAG

Abstract. We generalize results of Rosenlicht to give a necessary and sufficient condition for when order one differential equations of the form $D(x) = f(x)$ where f is a rational function is orthogonal to the constants. Following the main results of the paper, we also explain the connection between algebraic general solutions and weak orthogonality to the constants; a portion of this discussion is given in the appendix, written jointly with Joel Nagloo and Ngoc Thieu Vo.

1. Introduction

One of the central problems in the model theory of differential fields is to classify the strongly minimal sets up to nonorthogonality. A strongly minimal set is one in which every definable subset is finite or cofinite. In differential fields, strongly minimal sets are given by Kolchin-constructible sets for which the only proper relatively Kolchin-closed subsets (defined over any field extension) are finite sets of points. The importance of the problem of classifying strongly minimal sets comes various sources: foundational interest, applications in diophantine geometry, and the fact that the geometry of strongly minimal sets has been brought to bear in resolving seemingly more global aspects of the structure of differential fields.

The main results in this paper center on criteria for when an order one differential equation is orthogonal to the constants. Rosenlicht [16] proved that for differential equations of the form $D(x) = f(x)$ where f is a rational function with constant coefficients, the solution set is nonorthogonal to the constants if and only if $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ can be written as a derivative or a logarithmic derivative; Rosenlicht proved this in different language, and we explain the details of the result below. We prove a similarly strong characterization when $f(x)$ has coefficients from an arbitrary differential field. Following the main results of the paper, we also give some applications around algebraic general solutions of order one differential equations.

1.1. Differential forms and definable sets.

Fix a large differentially closed field $(\mathcal{U}, D)$. Hrushovski and Itai [5] took the following approach to studying order one differential varieties defined over the constants: given a curve C and a differential form ω on C, the natural manner to associate a strongly minimal with the pair (C, ω) is given by

$$\{x \in C \,|\, \omega_x(D(x)) = 1\}.$$

All order one differential varieties except those given by considering the constant points of some algebraic curve may be given in this manner, modulo some finite number of points. The approach using differential forms is essentially dual to studying sections $s : C \to TC$ of the tangent bundle which give the same information; a section s corresponds to the differential form ω by setting $\omega(s) = 1$. There, the pair (C, s) is called a D-variety, and is naturally associated with an order one differential variety:

$$\{x \in C \,|\, D(x) = s(x)\}.$$

Date: July 18, 2016.

In either approach, the point is that certain properties of the differential variety can be deduced from geometric considerations of the underlying algebraic variety. When C is a curve not defined over a constant differential field, then the set of points of the form $\{(a, D(a)) \mid a \in C(\mathcal{U})\}$ no longer lies in the $\mathcal{U}$-points of the tangent bundle of C, so the approach outlined in the previous paragraph does not work without modification. The Zariski closure of $\{(a, D(a)) \mid a \in C(\mathcal{U})\}$ is a component of a variety commonly called the prolongation of C, and studying differential varieties via sections of the prolongation is a well-established technique. To take up the dual approach of Hrushovski and Itai in this more general setting, Rosen [15, 14] developed the notion of τ-forms and their algebraic analog, τ-differentials. In section 2, we will recall Rosen's theory of τ-forms, which we use later in the paper.

1.2. **Differential function fields.** Let D be a derivation on a field k. If we extend D to $k(x)$ via $D(x) = f(x)$, then for $u \in k(x)$,

$$D(u) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} f(x) + \delta_1(u),$$

where δ_1 is the derivation on $k(x)$ induced by letting $\delta_1(x) = 0$. In the case that the rational function u is actually a polynomial, this expression is more familiar [8, for instance, see Lemma 5.11]; in that case, $\delta_1(u)$ is calculated by differentiating the coefficients of u with respect to D.

By *differential variety* over k, we mean Kolchin-closed subset of $\mathbb{A}^n$ defined over k; we will often regard differential varieties as synonomous with their $\mathcal{U}$-points. When V is an irreducible differential variety over k, we let $k\{V\}$ denote the differential coordinate ring of V, $k\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}/I(V)$, where $k\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ denotes the differential polynomial ring in $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, over k and $I(V)$ denotes the prime differential ideal in $k\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ consisting of those differential polynomials which vanish on V. We denote the fraction field of $k\{V\}$ by $k\langle V\rangle$.

By a *generic point* on a differential variety V over k, we mean a point $a \in V(\mathcal{U})$ such that the Kolchin polynomial of a over k is maximal among the Kolchin polynomials of all $\mathcal{U}$-points of V. We call the type of a over k the generic type of V over k. The generic point of a differential variety V over k is said to be *nonorthogonal* to $\mathcal{C}$ if for any differential field extension K of k, $\mathcal{C}_{K\langle a\rangle} = \mathcal{C}_K$. By [10, Proposition 2.6] this definition is a special case of the general model-theoretic notion.

A differential variety V over k is of order one if the transcendence degree of $k\langle V\rangle$ over k is one. For an order one differential variety V, the generic type of V is nonorthogonal to $\mathcal{C}$ if over some differential field extension K of k, there is a nonconstant definable map $g : V \to \mathcal{C}$. By quanitfier elimination and basic differential algebra, one can see that this is equivlent to the differential function field $K\langle V\rangle = Frac(K\{V\})$ having new transcendental constants K. An order one differential variety V over k is said to be *not weakly orthogonal* to the $\mathcal{C}$ over k if there is a nonconstant map $g : V \to \mathcal{C}$ which is defined over k.

To set the stage for the discussion of the results of this paper, we next prove the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{A}^1$ be the affine differential variety defined over k by the equation $D(x) = f(x)$ where $f(x) \in k(x)$. Then if $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ is of the form*

$$\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a - \delta_1(v)} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}}{au - \delta_1(u)}$$

for some $a \in k$, $u, v \in k(x)$, then V is nonorthogonal to the constants.

Proof. There are two cases.
Case 1: Suppose that b_1, b_2 are algebrically independent (over k) points on V and that $\frac{1}{f(x)} =$

$\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a-\delta_1(v)}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} D(v(x)) &= \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} D(x) + \delta_1(v) \\ &= \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \frac{a - \delta_1(v)}{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}} + \delta_1(v) \\ &= a. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $D(v(b_1) - v(b_2)) = 0$, and $v(b_1) - v(b_2)$ is trancendental over k by the algebraic independence of b_1 and b_2 over k. And thus V is nonorthogonal to the constants, because $x \mapsto v(x) - v(b_1)$ is a nonconstant map to the constants.

Case 2: Suppose that b_1, b_2 are algebrically independent (over k) points on V and $\frac{1}{f(x)} = \frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}}{au - \delta_1(u)}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} D\left(\frac{u(b_1)}{u(b_2)}\right) &= \frac{D(u(b_1))u(b_2) - D(u(b_2))u(b_1)}{(u(b_2))^2} \\ &= \frac{(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}(b_1)D(b_1) + \delta_1(u)(b_1))u(b_2) - (\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}(b_2)D(b_2) + \delta_1(u)(b_2))u(b_1)}{(u(b_2))^2} \\ &= \frac{(\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}(b_1)\frac{au(b_1) - \delta_1(u)(b_1)}{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}(b_1)} + \delta_1(u)(b_1))u(b_2) - (\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}(b_2)\frac{au(b_2) - \delta_1(u)(b_2)}{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}(b_2)} + \delta_1(u)(b_2))u(b_1)}{(u(b_2))^2} \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

As in the previous case, $D\left(\frac{u(b_1)}{u(b_2)}\right) = 0$, and $\frac{u(b_1)}{u(b_2)}$ is trancendental over k by the algebraic independence of b_1 and b_2 over k. Thus V is nonorthogonal to the constants, since $x \mapsto \frac{u(x)}{u(b_1)}$ is a nonconstant map to the constants. □

Theorem 1.1 is a generalization of a result of McGrail [10, Theorem 2.8]. To see this, note that if $f(x)$ is defined over k, a field with the trivial derivation, then with δ_1 defined as above, it is easy to see $\delta_1(v(x)) = 0$ because the coefficients of $v(x)$ are constants. In different terms, [10, Theorem 2.8] was almost certainly well-known to Rosenlicht [16], who proved the deeper and more surprising converse; namely, if V is the differential variety defined by $D(x) = f(x)$ where $f(x)$ is a rational function in x with constant coefficients, then V is orthogonal to the constants unless $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ is of the form:

$$c\frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}}{u} \quad \text{or} \quad c\frac{\partial v}{\partial x},$$

where u, v are rational functions over k. Nearly simultaneously with Rosenlicht's work, Shelah [17] and Kolchin [6] proved special cases of Rosenlicht's result. Ultimately, Kolchin and Shelah each proved the nonminimality of differential closure by proving certain sets of the form $D(x) = f(x)$, where $f(x)$ is defined over the constants to be geometrically disintegrated (or geometrically trivial). Rosenlicht's work went farther, giving a necessary and sufficient criterion for when such a set was geometrically disintegrated. In giving an exposition of Rosenlicht's results, Marker [8, section 6 of the chapter Model Theory of Differential Fields] proved generalizations of some of the theorems of [16], using similar techniques. Our first main result is to establish the converse of Theorem 1.1, a generalization of Rosenlicht's theorem for differential varieties over non-constant differential fields, which also generalizes results from [6, 8, 10, 16, 17]:

Theorem 1.2. *Let k be a differential field with $\mathcal{C}_k$ algebraically closed. Let $f \in k(x)$ and equip $k(x)$ with the differential field structure extending D on k induced by $D(x) = f(x)$. Then if $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ is not of the form*

$$\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a - \delta_1(v)} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}}{au - \delta_1(u)}$$

for some $a \in k$, $u, v \in k(x)$, then $\{x \mid D(x) = f(x)\}$ is orthogonal to the constants and algebraic closure is a locally finite closure operator.

Along the way, we generalize various other results of [8, 16]. The sort of problems considered here have analogues in the case of difference equations, where Medvedev and Scanlon [11] established results in a similar spirit.

1.3. **Algebraic general solutions.** Roughly, an algebraic general solution of an order one ODE over $\mathbb{C}(t)^{alg}$ is a one-parameter family, depending on an arbitrary constant, of solutions to the given equation. For instance, if the equation is given by

$$D(x) = \frac{x^3}{1 - tx^2},$$

then a one-parameter family of solutions is given by

$$x = \frac{c - \sqrt{c^2 - 4t}}{2t}.$$

Notice that

$$\frac{1 - tx^2}{x^3} = \frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left(\frac{1}{x} + tx\right)}{-\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\frac{1}{x} + tx\right)},$$

so $\frac{1-tx^2}{x^3}$ can be written in the form specified in Theorem 1.2. In section 4, we relate the notion of algebraic general solutions to the model theoretic notions studied in the previous sections.

1.4. **Appendix.** In the appendix, which is joint work with Ronnie Nagloo and Ngoc Thieu Vo, we present a slight refinement of our results on algebraic general solutions. I would like to thank the members of the Kolchin seminar, especially Alice Medvedev and Alexey Ovchinnikov, for running two workshops, in April and May of 2016 respectively. During the first of these workshops, a talk by Ngoc Thieu Vo lead me to consider the material in Section four. Discussions with with Ronnie Nagloo and Ngoc Thieu Vo during the second workshop lead to a refinement of the results, which currently appears in the appendix.

2. A very brief introduction to Rosen's theory of τ-forms

Let K over k be an extension of differential fields with the derivation denoted by D on both K and k. We will freely use the theory of differential forms of K over k denoting the K-vector space of such forms by $\Omega_{K/k}$. For details, see [8] or [16]. We let $\Omega^{\tau}_{K/k}$ denote the vector space of τ-forms of K over k. The vector space $\Omega^{\tau}_{K/k}$ is of dimension one more than the transcendence degree of the field extension K/k, and this space was developed and studied extensively by Rosen [15] [14], where a full development can be found. We will summarize Rosen's constructions here.

For an algebraic variety $V \subset \mathbb{A}^n$ over k such that the ideal of polynomial functions which vanish on V is given by $(f_1, \ldots, f_j) \subseteq k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, we define the *prolongation* of V to be the closed subset of $\mathbb{A}^{2n}$ given by the vanishing of $f_1, \ldots, f_n, D(f_1), \ldots, D(f_n) \in k[x_1, \ldots, x_n, x'_1, \ldots x'_n]$ where D is defined on the differential polynomial ring in $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ over k as usual:

$$D(f) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} x'_i + f^D.$$

The prolongation of V, denoted τV is thus a Zariski-closed subset of $\mathbb{A}^{2n}$ over k. One can show [4] [12], that the construction is functorial, and for $\phi : V \to W$ a rational map of algebraic varieties over k, there is an induced map $\tau\phi : \tau V \to \tau W$, given by $\tau\phi(a, u) = d\phi_a(u) + \phi^D(a)$.

When V is a smooth variety of dimension n, the prolongation τV is an affine bundle of rank n, but when V is singular, the structure of τV can be more complicated [4, see for instance]. It is still, however variety with a surjective projection map to V, and for $v \in V$, we let τV_v denote the fiber above v in τV. Let V be an algebraic variety over k. Let $\Phi[V]$ denote the collection of all functions ϕ, which take as input an element $v \in V$ and output a function $\phi(v) : \tau V_v \to \mathbb{A}^1$. Then $\Phi[V]$ is a $K[V]$-module and given any function $f \in K[V]$, by the above mentioned functoriality, $\tau f \in \Phi[V]$.

Let $\phi \in \Phi[V]$. We say ϕ is a *regular τ-form* if for every $v \in V$, we have some open subset containing v, U, such that $\phi|_U$ is contained in the $K[V]$-module generated by $\{\tau f \,|\, f \in K[U]\}$. The regular τ-forms on V are a $K[V]$-module, denoted by $\Omega^\tau[V]$. By [15, Proposition 2.6], for any $v \in V$, there is an open neighborhood, U, such that the $\Omega^\tau[U]$ is a free $K[U]$-module of rank equal to $dim(V)+1$. For two open sets $U_1, U_2 \subset V$, and $\omega_i \in \Omega^\tau[U_i]$, let $\omega_1 \equiv \omega_2$ if their restrictions to $U_1 \cap U_2$ are indentical. The $\equiv$-classes under this relation forms the collection of *rational τ-forms*, denoted $\Omega^\tau(V)$. The rational τ-forms, $\Omega^\tau(V)$, are a $K(V)$-vector space of dimension equal to $dim(V) + 1$ [15, 2.11].

Let $\phi : V \to W$ be a morphism of algebraic varieties over k. Then for any $\omega \in \Omega^\tau(W)$, we define the pullback $\phi^*\omega \in \Omega^\tau(V)$ by

$$\phi^*\omega(v, a) = \omega(\tau\phi(v, a)).$$

The structure of $\Omega(V)$ and $\Omega^\tau(V)$ depend only on the function field of V, so following Rosen [14], for $K = k(V)$, the function field of a variety, we write $\Omega^\tau_{K/k}$ for the the vector space of τ-forms of V over k. Locally, any τ-form can be written as $\omega + f(x)$, where $\omega \in \Omega_{K/k}$ and $f(x) \in K$.

We say that two τ-forms are *equivalent*, writtng $\tau_1 \sim \tau_2$ if there is some $g \in K^*$ such that $\tau_1 = g\tau_2$. The significance of τ-forms on curves (i.e. when K is the function field of a curve) lies in that their equivalence classes parameterize strongly minimal sets living on the curve in the following straigthforward manner. Given a curve C and a τ-form locally given as $\omega + f(x)$, then let

$$(C, \omega + f)^\sharp = \{x \in C \,|\, \omega_x(Dx) + f(x) = 0\}.$$

It is clear than any two $\sim$-equivalent τ-forms define the same set, modulo finitely many points [15, Corollary 4.3]. Let $g : C_1 \to C_2$ be a dominant rational map of nonsingular curves, and ω_i be a τ-form on C_i such that $g((C_1, \omega_1)^\sharp) \subseteq (C_2, \omega_2)^\sharp$ (except for perhaps a finite set). Then $\omega_1 \sim g^*\omega_2$ [15, Lemma 4.6].

3. Differential function fields

Let K/k be an extension of differential fields so that

(1) K is a function field over k - that is $\text{trdeg}(K/k) = 1$ and K is finitely generated as a field.
(2) K is generated by elements $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ which are solutions of the differential equation: $D(x_i) = f_i(x_i)$, where $f_i(x) \in k(x)$.

The field K is equipped with a derivation D, but there are other natural derivations with which K might be equipped. Our arguments will make use of another differential structure on K, and so we introduce the following notation:

Definition 3.1. When F is a field equipped with a derivation δ. We denote by $\mathcal{C}^\delta_F$ the field of constants of F with respect to the derivation δ on F. When the derivation is clear from the context, we will omit it in the superscript.

Definition 3.2. Let $x \in K$ be some element which is transcendental over k. We define a new derivation δ_1 on $k(x)$. Let $\delta_1|_K = D$, and let $\delta_1(x) = 0$. Then since $K \subseteq k(x)^{alg}$, and δ_1 extends to $k(x)^{alg}$ uniquely [7], δ_1 induces a unique derivation on K, which we will denote by δ_1 as well.

By assumption, K is generated by elements $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ which satisfy $D(x_i) = f_i(x_i)$, where $f_i(x) \in k(x)$. For the remainder of the section, we will assume that δ_1 is the derivation defined above with $x = x_1$.

Now, if $D_0 := D - \delta_1$, then for a rational function u, $D_0(u(x)) = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} D(x) + \delta_1(u(x)) - \delta_1(u(x))$. Again, this formula is more familiar in the case that u is a polynomial [8, see Lemma 5.11]. Next, we define a map D' from the space of 1-forms to the space of τ-forms. When k is a field of constants, our map D' is equal to the map defined in [8, Corollary 6.8].

Definition 3.3. Let $D_0 := D - \delta_1$. We define $D' : \Omega_{K/k} \to \Omega^{\tau}_{K/k}$ via

$$D'\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i dx_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\left(D_0(g_i)dx_i + \frac{D_0^2(x_i)}{D_0(x_i)} g_i dx_i\right) + D_0(x_i)\delta_1(g_i) + g_i\delta_1(D_0(x_i))\right).$$

When $D_0(x) = 0$, we define $\frac{D_0^2(x)}{D_0(x)} = 0$.

Lemma 3.4. *For $h \in K$ and $\omega = \sum g_i dx_i \in \Omega_{K/k}$,*

$$D'(h\omega) \quad = \quad hD'(\omega) + D_0(h)\omega + \delta_1(h)\sum_{i=1}^{n} D_0(x_i)g_i$$

Proof. The proof is simply a direct calculation from the definition:

$$\begin{aligned} D'(h\omega) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\left(D_0(hg_i) + \frac{D_0^2(x_i)}{D_0(x_i)} hg_i\right) dx_i + D_0(x_i)\delta_1(hg_i) + hg_i\delta_1(D_0(x_i))\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(D_0(h)g_i + D_0(g_i)h + \frac{D_0^2(x_i)}{D_0(x_i)} hg_i\right) dx_i \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (D_0(x_i)\delta_1(h)g_i + D_0(x_i)\delta_1(g_i)h + hg_i\delta_1(D_0(x_i))) \\ &= hD'(\omega) + D_0(h)\omega + \delta_1(h)\sum_{i=1}^{n} D_0(x_i)g_i. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.5. *Let $k \subseteq K$ be an extension of differential fields such that $trdeg(K/k) = 1$. Let f be a rational function in a single variable. Let $x \in K$ satisfy $D(x) = af(x)$ for $a \in \mathcal{C}_k^D$. Let $y \in K$ satisfy $D(y) = bf(y)$ for $b \in \mathcal{C}_k^D$. Then if x and y are not algebraic over k,*

$$s\frac{dx}{f(x)} = \frac{dy}{bf(y) + \delta_1(y)}$$

for some $s \in k$ such that $D(s) = 0$.

Proof. First we show that $D'\left(\frac{dy}{bf(y)+\delta_1(y)}\right) = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
D'\left(\frac{dy}{bf(y)+\delta_1(y)}\right) &= \left(D_0\left(\frac{1}{bf(y)+\delta_1(y)}\right)+\frac{D_0^2(y)}{D_0(y)}\frac{1}{bf(y)+\delta_1(y)}\right)dy \\
&\quad +D_0(y)\delta_1\left(\frac{1}{bf(y)+\delta_1(y)}\right)+\frac{1}{bf(y)+\delta_1(y)}\delta_1(D_0(y)) \\
&= \left(\frac{-D_0(bf(y)+\delta_1(y)}{(bf(y)+\delta_1(y))^2}+\frac{D_0(bf(y)+\delta_1(y))}{bf(y)+\delta_1(y)}\frac{1}{bf(y)+\delta_1(y)}\right)dy \\
&\quad +(bf(y)+\delta_1(y))\left(\frac{-\delta_1(bf(y)+\delta_1(y))}{(bf(y)+\delta_1(y))^2}\right)+\frac{1}{bf(y)+\delta_1(y)}\delta_1(bf(y)+\delta_1(y)) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

A similar calculation shows that $D'\left(\frac{dy}{f(x)}\right)=0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
D'\left(\frac{dx}{f(x)}\right) &= \left(D_0\left(\frac{1}{f(x)}\right)+\frac{D_0^2(x)}{D_0(x)}\frac{1}{f(x)}\right)dx \\
&\quad +D_0(x)\delta_1\left(\frac{1}{f(x)}\right)+\frac{1}{f(x)}\delta_1(D_0(x)) \\
&= \left(\frac{-D_0(f(x))}{(f(x))^2}+\frac{D_0(af(x))}{af(x)}\frac{1}{f(x)}\right)dx \\
&\quad +(af(x))\left(\frac{-\delta_1(f(x))}{(f(x))^2}\right)+\frac{1}{f(x)}\delta_1(af(x)) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

It suffices to consider the case that $K=k(x,y)$. The K-vector space $\Omega_{K/k}$ is dimension one, so $\frac{dx}{f(x)}$ spans the space. So, there is some $s\in K$ such that $s\frac{dx}{f(x)}=\frac{dy}{f(y)+\delta_1(y)}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= D'\left(\frac{dy}{f(y)+\delta_1(y)}\right) \\
&= D'\left(s\frac{dx}{f(x)}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D'\left(s\frac{dx}{f(x)}\right) &= sD'\left(\frac{dx}{f(x)}\right)+D_0(s)\left(\frac{dx}{f(x)}\right)+\delta_1(s) \\
&= 0+D_0(s)\left(\frac{dx}{f(x)}\right)+\delta_1(s)a \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

and so we must have that $\delta_1(s)=0$ and $D_0(s)=0$, and thus $D(s)=0$. Because K/k is a field extension of transcendence degree one, s must be algebraic over $k(x)$. But, since $\delta_1(s)=0$, it must be the case that $s\in C_{k(x)}^{\delta_1}$. By [16, Lemma 3] the genus of $C_{k(x)}^{\delta_1}$ over $C_k^{\delta_1}$ is one, and thus $C_{k(x)}^{\delta_1}=C_k^{\delta_1}(x)=C_k^D(x)$. Since $D_0=D-\delta_1$ and $D_0(s)$ and $\delta_1(s)$ are both zero, we have $D(s)=0$. Since x is not a D-constant, the field of D-constants of $C_k^D(x)$ is C_k^D. Now since $D(s)=0$, we must have that $s\in C_k^D$. □

Theorem 3.6. *Let k be a differential field with $\mathcal{C}_k$ algebraically closed. Let $f \in k(x)$ and equip $k(x)$ with the differential field structure extending D on k induced by $D(x) = f(x)$. Then if $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ is not of the form*

$$\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a - \delta_1(v)} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}}{au - \delta_1(u)}$$

for some $a \in k$, $u, v \in k(x)$, then $\mathcal{C}_k = C_{k(x)}$.

Proof. Let k be a differential field with $\mathcal{C}_k$ algebraically closed. Let $f \in k(x)$ such that $D(x) = f(x)$. By [16, Lemma 3], if $C_{k(x)} \neq \mathcal{C}_k$, then $C_{k(x)}$ is a genus zero function field. So, there is some $t \in k(x)$ such that $C_{k(x)} = C(t)$. Consider the differential forms $\frac{dx}{f(x)}$ and dt in $\Omega_{k(x)/k}$. Since $\Omega_{k(x)/k}$ is a one-dimensional vector space over $k(x)$, there is some $g \in k(x)$ such that $\frac{dx}{f(x)} = g dt$.

By the computations in Lemma 3.5, $D'\left(\frac{dx}{f(x)}\right) = 0$. Now, using Lemma 3.4 (again, with δ_1 as above):

$$\begin{aligned} D'(g dt) &= \left(D_0(g) + \frac{D_0^2(t)}{D_0(t)} g\right) dt + D_0(t)\delta_1(g) + g\delta_1(D(t)) \\ &= \left(D(g) - \delta_1(g) + \frac{D_0(-\delta_1(t))}{-\delta_1(t)} g\right) dt - \delta_1(t)\delta_1(g) + g\delta_1(-\delta_1(t)) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, noting that this τ-form being zero implies that the coefficient of dt is zero and the rational function appearing after dt is zero.

$$\frac{D(g) - \delta_1(g)}{g} + \frac{D(\delta_1(t)) - \delta_1^2(t)}{\delta_1(t)} = 0 \tag{1}$$

and

$$-\delta_1(t)\delta_1(g) - g\delta_1^2(t) = 0. \tag{2}$$

From equation 2, we can see that

$$-\frac{\delta_1(g)}{g} = \frac{\delta_1^2(t)}{\delta_1(t)}.$$

Applying this relation to equation 1, we have

$$\frac{D(g)}{g} = -\frac{D(\delta_1(t))}{\delta_1(t)}.$$

So,

$$\frac{D(g\delta_1(t))}{g\delta_1(t)} = \frac{D(g)\delta_1(t) + gD(\delta_1(t))}{g\delta_1(t)} = \frac{D(g)}{g} + \frac{D(\delta_1(t))}{\delta_1(t)} = 0.$$

And thus, $D(g\delta_1(t)) = 0$. But $C_K = C_k(t)$ and $\delta_1(t) \in k$. Thus $\frac{g}{\delta_1(t)} \in \mathcal{C}_k(t)$. So, $g \in k(t)$. Now we can apply partial fraction decomposition to $\frac{dx}{f(x)}$ and $g dt$ in $k(x)$ and $k(t)$, respectively to obtain expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dx}{f(x)} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \frac{du_i}{u_i} + dv \\ g dt &= \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i \frac{dw_i}{w_i} + dy \end{aligned}$$

where $c_1, \ldots, c_n$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_m$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Now let $c_1, \ldots, c_N$ be a basis for $c_1, \ldots, c_n, b_1, \ldots, b_m$ over $\mathbb{Q}$.

Then letting $u_j = 1$, for $j = n+1, \ldots, N$, and appropriately redefining the terms w_j, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dx}{f(x)} &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i \frac{du_i}{u_i} + dv \\ gdt &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i \frac{dw_i}{w_i} + dy \end{aligned}$$

where we can take $b_i = \frac{c_i}{m}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Thus

$$mc_i \frac{du_i}{u_i} - c_i \frac{dw_i}{w_i} = c_i \frac{d\left(\frac{u_i^m}{w_i}\right)}{\frac{u_i^m}{w_i}}$$

and so

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i \frac{d\left(\frac{u_i^m}{w_i}\right)}{\frac{u_i^m}{w_i}} + d(mv - y) = 0.$$

By [8, 6.10] we conclude that

$$d\left(\frac{u_i^m}{w_i}\right) = 0$$

for each i and

$$d(mv - y) = 0.$$

Since the extension $k(x)/k$ is purely transcendental, we have that $mv - y \in k$. So, $D(mv - y) = mD(v) \in k$ and thus $D(v) \in k$. So, noting that $D(v) = \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} f(x) + \delta_1(v)$, we have that $\frac{\partial v}{\partial x} f(x) + \delta_1(v) = a$ for some $a \in k$. Thus, if $\frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \neq 0$,

$$f(x) = \frac{a - \delta_1(v)}{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}. \tag{3}$$

Similarly, $d\left(\frac{u_i^m}{w_i}\right) = 0$, so $\frac{u_i^m}{w_i} \in k$. Thus $D\left(\frac{u_i^m}{w_i}\right) \in k$.

$$\begin{aligned} D\left(\frac{u_i^m}{w_i}\right) &= \frac{mu_i^{m-1} D(u_i) + \delta_1(u_i^m)}{w_i} \\ &= \frac{mu_i^{m-1} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x} D(x) + \delta_1(u_i^m)}{w_i} \\ &= \frac{mu_i^{m-1} \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x} f(x) + mu_i^{m-1} \delta_1(u_i)}{w_i} \\ &= \frac{mu_i^m}{w_i} \cdot \frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} f(x) + \delta_1(u_i)}{u_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{mu_i^m}{w_i} \in k$, we must have $\frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} f(x) + \delta_1(u_i)}{u_i} \in k$. So, let $\frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} f(x) + \delta_1(u_i)}{u_i} = a$ for some $a \in k$. Then, if $\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x} \neq 0$, we have that

$$f(x) = \frac{au_i - \delta_1(u_i)}{\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x}}. \tag{4}$$

Now, as $\frac{dx}{f(x)} \neq 0$, one of $\frac{\partial u_1}{\partial x}, \dots, \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial v}{\partial x}$ must be nonzero, and thus one of the expressions from eqnations or must hold, and so $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ must be of the form

$$\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a - \delta_1(v)} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}}{au - \delta_1(u)}$$

for some $a \in k$ and $u, v \in k(x)$.

□

Remark 3.7. In certain instances, it is not hard to see that the techniques of the previous proofs can be used to prove stronger results about the algebraic relations between solutions of the differential equation $D(x) = f(x)$. For instance, assume that y, z are solutions which are algebraic over $\mathcal{C}_k^D$ and assume that

$$\frac{1}{f(x)} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i \frac{\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x}}{u_i} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial x}$$

where d_i are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Note that by [8, remark at the bottom of page 76], we can always write $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ in this form, but perhaps with an empty sum or no v. So, we are assuming this is not the case. By the assumption that the algebraic relation between y and z is defined over $\mathcal{C}_k^D$, it is easy to see that $\delta_1(z) = 0$. Then following the argument of [8, top of page 78] yields that $\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}(y) \cdot D(y) = \frac{\partial v}{\partial x}(z) \cdot D(z)$. So, we obtain a bound on the degree of generically finite-to-finite correspondence between the definable set $\{x \,|\, D(x) = f(x)\}$ and itself defined over $\mathcal{C}_k^D$.

So, it seems natural to pose the problem when f is not necessarily defined over the constants. That is, give a bound for the degree of the generically finite-to-finite correspondences between $\{x \,|\, D(x) = f(x)\}$ and itself defined over k. Is there a uniform bound which depends only on the degree of f?

Remark 3.8. Compared to Rosenlicht's criterion [16], the criterion given in Theorem 3.6 has a seemingly serious downside. Because it depends on the differential structure of the field k, it would *seem* that $f(x)$ might not be written in the form

$$\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a - \delta_1(v)} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}}{au - \delta_1(u)}$$

for $u, v \in k(x)$, but $f(x)$ might be written in one of the specified forms for $u, v \in F(x)$ where F/k is an extension of differential fields. We will show that somewhat surprisingly this is *not* the case - if $f(x)$ can be written in one of the specified forms over $F(x)$ for some extension field F/k, then already $f(x)$ can be written in one of the specified forms in $k(x)$.

Proposition 3.9. *Let $f(x) \in k(x)$ be such that $f(x)$ can not be written as*

$$\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a - \delta_1(v)} \quad \textit{or} \quad \frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}}{au - \delta_1(u)}$$

for some $a \in k$ and $u, v \in k(x)$. Then for any differential field extension F/k, $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ can not be written as

$$\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a - \delta_1(v)} \quad \textit{or} \quad \frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}}{au - \delta_1(u)}$$

for some $a \in F$ and $u, v \in F(x)$.

Proof. Let $X = \{x \,|\, D(x) = f(x)\}$. Suppose that $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ *can* be written as

$$\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a - \delta_1(v)} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}}{au - \delta_1(u)}$$

for some $a \in F$ and $u, v \in F(x)$. Then by Theorem 1.1, X is nonorthogonal to the constants. But if $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ *can not* be written as

$$\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a - \delta_1(v)} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}}{au - \delta_1(u)}$$

for some $a \in k$ and $u, v \in k(x)$, then X is nonorthogonal to the constants, and is weakly orthogonal to the constants over k.

In this case, by [13, Proposition 2.23], there is a k-definable equaivalence relation $\sim$ on X (perhaps discarding finitely many points) with finite classes such that by [13, Propositions 2.21 and 2.22] there is the regular action of an infinite definable group G on $X/\sim$ (note that all of the generic elements of X have the same type over k together with the constants of $\mathcal{U}$). By elimination of imaginaries, there is a k-definable function g on X such that the fibers of g are the $\sim$-classes of X. But the definable functions on X are rational functions, so the image of X under g is birational to a Kolchin-closed set Y living on a genus zero curve. In particular, the genus of $k\langle Y\rangle$ over k is zero.

The action of the definable group on Y implies that the differential galois group $k\langle Y\rangle/k$ is infinite. By Matsuda's Theorem [9], $K\langle Y\rangle$ contains an element x such that $D(x) \in k$ (an integral) or $D(x)/x \in k$ (an integral of an exponential) or $K\langle x\rangle$ is a differential elliptic function field. The last option is impossible since the genus of $k\langle Y\rangle$ over k is zero.

Thus, there is a morphism $g_1 : Y \to \mathbb{P}^1$ such that the τ-form giving Y on $\mathbb{P}^1$ is the pullback $g_1^*(\omega)$, where ω is the τ-form corresponding to an integral or integral of an exponential. That is, using coordinates $[x : y]$ for $\mathbb{P}^1$, $\omega = dx - a$ or $\omega = dx - ax$ in the open neighboorhood $y = 1$. Then X is given by the τ-form $g^*(g_1^*(\omega)) = h^*(\omega)$ where $h = g \circ g_1$.

The $\tau h : \tau\mathbb{P}^1 \to \tau\mathbb{P}^1$ is given in the open neighborhood $y = 1$ by $(x, dx) \mapsto \big(h(x), \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}dx + h_1^\delta(h(x))\big)$. So, in the case that $\omega = dx - a$, the pullback is $h^*(\omega) = \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}dx + \delta_1(h(x)) - a$, which is equivalent to $dx + \frac{\delta_1(h(x))-a}{\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}}$, and thus the corresponding Kolchin-closed set is defined by $D(x) = -\frac{\delta_1(h(x))-a}{\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}}$ and thus $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ is of the desired form. In the case that $\omega = dx - ax$, the pullback is $h^*(\omega) = \frac{\partial h}{\partial x}dx + \delta_1(h(x)) - ah(x)$, which is equivalent to $dx + \frac{\delta_1(h(x))-ah}{\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}}$, and thus the corresponding Kolchin-closed set is defined by $D(x) = -\frac{\delta_1(h(x))-ah(x)}{\frac{\partial h}{\partial x}}$ and thus again $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ is of the desired form. □

Taken together, Proposition 3.9 and Theorem 3.6 imply all but the final sentence of Theorem 1.2. The local finiteness of algebraic closure follows by $\aleph_0$-categoricity of order one disintegrated strongly minimal sets in DCF_0 [3, Theorem 6.2].

Remark 3.10. The proof of Proposition 3.9 actually reveals a bit more than the statement of the theorem. One can see that if X is not weakly orthogonal to the constants, then $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ can be written in the form $\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a-\delta_1(v)}$, because in the case of non weak orthogonality, we have a definable map to the constants, so we know that X is given by a τ-form equivalent to the pullback of the of the form dx on $\mathbb{P}^1$. The computations in the proof of Proposition 3.9 then give the specified form for $f(x)$.

We have proved that whether or not a rational function $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ can be written in one of the two forms

$$\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a - \delta_1(v)} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}}{au - \delta_1(u)}$$

for some $a \in k$ and $u, v \in k(x)$ depends only on the differential field generated by the coefficients appearing in $f(x)$. But as pointed out above, it is possible that a rational function written in the form $\frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}}{au-\delta_1(u)}$ over some field k can not be written in the form $\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a-\delta_1(v)}$ over k but can be written in that form over a field extension k_1 of k. Next, we give the simplest example of this.

Consider the differential equation $D(x) = x$. Over $k = \mathbb{Q}$, $\frac{1}{f(x)} = \frac{1}{x} = \frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}}{au - \delta_1(u)}$ for $a = 1$ and $u = x$. It is not hard to show that $\frac{1}{x}$ can not be written in the form $\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a - \delta_1(v)}$ over $\mathbb{Q}$. However, if we work in the field $\mathbb{Q}(e^t)$, and set $v = e^{-t}x$ and $a = 0$, then we have written $\frac{1}{x}$ in the desired form. Next, we explain the situation generally.

Suoppose that $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ can be written in the form $\frac{\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}}{au - \delta_1(u)}$ over the differential field k. If k contains one solution to the equation $D(x) = f(x)$, we know by the proof of Proposition 3.9 that the τ-form $dx - f(x)$ can be written as the pullback of the τ-form dx on $\mathbb{A}^1$, and thus can be written in the desired form. So, the example described in the previous paragraph is indicative of the general situation.

Remark 3.11. The astute reader will have noticed that the proof of Proposition 3.9 does not require Theorem 3.6 or the techniques used therein, and the proof of Proposition 3.9 can be used to deduce Theorem 1.2. We have chosen to include the proof of Theorem 3.6 and expose the techniques used therein for reasons related to Remark 3.7; as we have shown, at least with addition assumptions, the proof of Theorem 3.6 gives more information about the possible algebraic relations between solutions of the equation.

4. Algebraic general solutions and weak orthogonality

The results in this section apply to differential equations over the field $F = k(t)^{alg}$, where k is a differential field which is a finitely generated differential field extension of its constant field, and the derivation is extended to F by setting $D(t) = 1$. We assume that $\mathcal{C}_k = \mathcal{C}_F$. This assumption is satisfied, for instance, whenever k does not contain an element a such that $D(a) = 1$. So, in particular, if k is a field of constants. In order to relate our results to some computational differential algebraic notions [18, 1], we in particular have in mind the case $F = \mathbb{C}(t)^{alg}$ for the remainder of the section.

Recall, we say that an F-definable set X, is *weakly orthogonal* to the constants over F if there is no nonconstant F-definable map from X to the field of constants. We say that an F-definable set X, is *orthogonal* to the constants if there is no nonconstant K-definable map from X to the field of constants, where K is any differential field extension of F.

A general solution of an order one ODE over a differential field (F, D) is an algebraic family of solutions with one independent constant parameter. A formal differential algebraic definition was given by Ritt [1, see Definition 2.3].

Definition 4.1. Let $p \in F\{y\} \setminus F$ be an irreducible differential polynomial, and let Σ_p denote the prime differential ideal $\{p\} : S_p^\infty \subset F\{y\}$. A general solution of $p(y) = 0$ is a generic zero of Σ_p over F. An *algebraic general solution* of $p(y) = 0$ is a general solution $\hat{y}$ which satisfies

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n} \sum_{i=0}^{m_j} a_{i,j} t^i y^j = 0$$

where $a_{i,j} \in \mathcal{C}\langle k \rangle$. When $n = 1$, $\hat{y}$ is called a rational general solution.

Note that our definition is slightly more general than that of [1, see Definition 2.3], where k was assumed to be $\bar{Q}$; this explains why in our formulation $a_{i,j} \in \mathcal{C}\langle k \rangle$ instead of $\mathcal{C}$ as in [1].

When F is a differential field field and we consider order one differential equation X with coefficients in F, an a priori weaker property than having an algebraic general solution over K is that F contain infinitely many solutions to X. But for order one differential varieties over differential fields which are finitely generated extensions of their constant fields, the converse is true. The proof follows immediately from a recent result of Moosa and the author, which we state here for convenience:

Theorem 4.2. *(Corollary 5.10 [3]) Suppose $F \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is a constant subfield, and L is a finitely generated Δ-field extension of F. Let $X \subseteq K^n$ be an L-irreducible Δ-variety. There exists an algebraic variety V over the constants of L, L_0, and a dominant Δ-rational map $f : X \to V(\mathcal{C})$ over L, such that all but finitely many codimension one L-irreducible Δ-subvarieties of X arise as L-irreducible components of Δ-subvarieties of the form $f^{-1}\big(W(\mathcal{C})\big)$ where $W \subseteq V$ is an algebraic subvariety over L_0.*

Proposition 4.3. *Let $f(x) \in F\{x\}$ be an order one irreducible differential polynomial. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *The equation $f(x) = 0$ has infinitely many solutions in $\mathbb{F}$.*
2. *The definable set $X = \{x \mid f(x) = 0\}$ is not weakly orthogonal to $\mathcal{C}$ over F.*
3. *The equation $f(x) = 0$ has an algebraic general solution over F.*

Proof. The first condition implies the second by [3, Corollary 5.10], since each $k(t)^{alg}$ point on X is a co-order one subvariety of X, so we obtain $g : X \to V(\mathcal{C})$ be a $k(t)^{alg}$ definable nonconstant map where V is an algebraic curve defined over the constants. Then since both sets are strongly minimal, the map g has finite fibers and its image is co-finite. The fiber above a generic point of $V(\mathcal{C})$ is an algebraic general solution. The third condition clearly implies the first. □

Theorem 4.4. *Consider the differential equation given by $D(x) = f(x)$ where $f(x) \in F(x)$. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *$D(x) = f(x)$ has infinitely many solutions in F.*
2. *$D(x) = f(x)$ has an algebraic general solution.*
3. *$\frac{1}{f(x)}$ can be written in the form*

$$\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a - \delta_1(v)}$$

for some $v \in F(x)$ and $D(x) = f(x)$ has one solution in F.

In the case that $f(x)$ can be written in the specified form, the degree of any of the solutions of $D(x) = f(x)$ in $F = k(t)^{alg}$ can be effectively bounded by knowing the degree of one solution.

Proof. Let $X = \{x \mid D(x) = f(x)\}$. If $D(x) = f(x)$ has infinitely many solutions in F, then by [3, Corollary 5.10], there is a nontrivial F-definable map $g : X \to \mathcal{C}$ which is nonconstant. Because $D(x)$ is a rational function of x, on an open subset of affine one-space, such a map is given by a rational function of x, defined over F. Then $g^{-1}(c)$ for general $c \in \mathcal{C}$ gives an algebraic general solution. Thus X is not weakly orthogonal to the constants over $k(t)^{alg}$. Now, Theorem 1.2 and Remark 3.10 imply that $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ can be written in the desired form.

For the boundedness claim of the proof, one notes that for any two solutions b_1, b_2 of X, either $v(b_1) - v(b_2)$ or $\frac{v(b_1)}{v(b_2)}$ is a complex number. This bounds the degree of b_1 in terms of the degree of b_2 and v. The final claim of the theorem follows by noting that the definable map to the constants given in Theorem 1.1 is defined over any field containing the field of definition of the differential variety and any single solution to the differential variety. □

Remark 4.5. In light of Theorem 1.2 and the results of this section, two natural questions remain. First, when can a rational function be written in the specified form? Second, when does an equation in the specified form have one solution in $k(t)^{alg}$?

Completing these two steps would yield an algorithm for checking when a differential equation of the form $D(x) = f(x)$ has an algebraic general solution as well as giving a method of parameterizing all of the algebraic solutions.

References

[1] JM Aroca, J Cano, Ruyong Feng, and Xiao-Shan Gao. Algebraic general solutions of algebraic ordinary differential equations. In *Proceedings of the 2005 international symposium on Symbolic and algebraic computation*, pages 29–36. ACM, 2005.

[2] A Eremenko. Rational solutions of first-order differential equations. *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae. Series A1. Mathematica*, 23(1):181–190, 1998.

[3] James Freitag and Rahim Moosa. Finiteness theorems on hypersurfaces in partial differential-algebraic geometry. *Under review, http://arxiv.org/abs/1606.08492*, 2016.

[4] James Freitag and Omar Leon Sanchez. Effective uniform bounding in partial differential fields. *Advances in Mathematics*, 288:308–336, 2016.

[5] Ehud Hrushovski and Masanori Itai. On model complete differential fields. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, Volume 355(11):4267–4296, 2003.

[6] Ellis R Kolchin. Constrained extensions of differential fields. *Advances in Mathematics*, 12(2):141–170, 1974.

[7] Ellis R. Kolchin. *Differential Algebra and Algebraic Groups*. Academic Press, New York, 1976.

[8] David Marker, Margit Messmer, and Anand Pillay. *Model theory of fields*. A. K. Peters/CRC Press, 2005.

[9] Michihiko Matsuda. The group of automorphisms of a differential algebraic function field. *Nagoya Mathematical Journal*, 74:87–94, 1979.

[10] Tracey McGrail. The search for trivial types. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, 44(2):263–271, 2000.

[11] Alice Medvedev and Thomas Scanlon. Invariant varieties for polynomial dynamical systems. *Annals of Mathematics*, 179(1):81–177, 2014.

[12] Rahim Moosa and Thomas Scanlon. Jet and prolongation spaces. *Journal de l'Institut de Mathematiques de Jussieu*, 9(2):391–430, 2010.

[13] Bruno Poizat. *Stable Groups*. Mathematical Surveys and monographs, volume 87, American Mathematical Society, 1987.

[14] Eric Rosen. Differentials over differential fields. *preprint, http://arxiv.org/pdf/math/0701508.pdf*, 2007.

[15] Eric Rosen. Order 1 strongly minimal sets in differentially closed fields. *preprint, http://arxiv.org/pdf/math/0510233.pdf*, 2007.

[16] Maxwell Rosenlicht. The nonminimality of the differential closure. *Pacific J. Math.*, 52:529 – 537, 1974.

[17] Saharon Shelah. Differentially closed fields. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 16(3):314–328, 1973.

[18] Ngoc Thieu Vo and Franz Winkler. Algebraic general solutions of first order algebraic odes. In *Computer Algebra in Scientific Computing*, pages 479–492. Springer, 2015.

Appendix: The generalized Poincaré problem and algebraic general solutions of order one degree one differential equations
by James Freitag, Joel Nagloo, and Ngoc Thieu Vo

Given two polynomials $f, g \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$, consider the polynomial vector field on $\mathbb{A}^2$ given by:

$$\begin{aligned} x' &= f(x, y) \\ y' &= g(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

where we might think of x, y as functions of a variable t. A *rational first integral* is a rational function in x and y whose value is constant along solutions of the vector field. Given this system, we have the associated differential equation:

$$\frac{dy}{dx} = \frac{g(x, y)}{f(x, y)}. \tag{5}$$

If equation 5 has a one-parameter family of algebraic solutions, then the minimal polynomial over $\mathbb{C}(t)$ of a sufficiently general member of the family gives a rational first integral to the planar system. All but finitely many invariant curves of the planar system are given by such minimal polynomials. Effectively bounding total degree in x and t of the solutions to 5 is one of the equivalent forms of what is known as the *Poincaré problem.*

Several natural generalizations of the problem exist, see [2]. We will be interested in the case in which $\mathbb{C}$ is replaced by a field F which is a differential subfield of the algebraic closure of a differential field which is finitely generated over its constant field. We extend D from F to $F(t)^{alg}$

by setting $D(t) = 1$. We will assume that $\mathcal{C}_{F(t)} = \mathcal{C}_F$. It would be interesting to understand, in this more general context, the precise connection between solutions to the order one ODE and the D-subvarieties of the associated planar system (the connection in the constant coefficient case is described in the previous paragraph).

In Theorem 4.4 above, it was shown that if $D(x) = f(x)$ has infinitely many solutions in $F(t)^{alg}$, then it has an algebraic general solution, and $\frac{1}{f(x)}$ can be written in the form

$$\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{a - \delta_1(v)}.$$

Further, for $f(x)$ which can be put into the specified form, the equation has an algebraic general solution if and only if it has one solution in $F(t)^{alg}$.

First, let $A \in \mathcal{U}$ be such that $D(A) = a$. It may or may not be the case that such an A can be chosen in $F(t)^{alg}$. In any case, let $x_0(t, c)$ be the function implicitly defined by

$$A(t) - v(t, x) + c = 0.$$

We claim that x_0 is the general solution of $D(x) = f(x)$. To see this, note that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= D(A(t) - v(t, x) + c) \\ &= a - \delta_1(v(x)) - \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} D(x) \end{aligned}$$

And so solving for $D(x)$, we see that

$$D(x) = \frac{a - \delta_1(v)}{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}.$$

This implies that $D(x) = f(x)$ has an algebraic general solution if and only if the function a has an integral in $F(t)^{alg}$. By replacing v with $v_1 = v - A(t)$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{f(x)} = \frac{-\frac{\partial v_1}{\partial x}}{\delta_1(v_1)}.$$

Thus, we obtain a stronger version of Theorem 4.4:

Theorem A.6. *Consider the differential equation given by $D(x) = f(x)$ where $f(x) \in F(t)^{alg}(x)$. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *The equation $D(x) = f(x)$ has infinitely many solutions in $F(t)^{alg}$.*
2. *The equation $D(x) = f(x)$ has an algebraic general solution (in $F(t)^{alg}$).*
3. *$\frac{1}{f(x)}$ can be written in the form*

$$\frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{-\delta_1(v)}$$

for some $v \in F(t)^{alg}(x)$

In the case that $F = \mathbb{C}(t)^{alg}$, the result says that the equation $D(x) = f(x)$ is not weakly orthogonal to the constants precisely in the case that we can find v such that

$$\frac{1}{f(x)} = \frac{\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}}{-\frac{\partial v}{\partial t}}.$$

University of California, Los Angeles, Department of Mathematics, 520 Portola Plaza, Math Sciences Building 6363, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555, USA

E-mail address: freitag@math.ucla.edu